

Interview Summary

Application No.
08/468,610

Applicant(s)
Burton et al.

Examiner
Jon P. Weber, Ph.D.

Group Art Unit
1808

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jon P. Weber, Ph.D.

(3) Michael Wityshyn

(2) Gerald Swiss

(4) Landon Steele & Simon Burton

Date of Interview 11 Dec 1996

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☒ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☒ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Video Conference

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all generally

Identification of prior art discussed:
all relied upon

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
Attorney argued that Jost and Teichberg are not solving the same problem in the same manner and are irrelevant. It was argued that Kasche worked at a pH where the resin is charged. It was argued that Sasaki used resin at pH less than 5 to be uncharged and does not suggest using resin at other than low pH. The claims are to be amended to binding at pH 5-9. Sasaki is said to recognize the problem of low pH but not to suggest a solution. It was argued that in re Duell controls for the composition which must be considered absent methods limitations. It was argued that none of the references anticipate or suggest compositions of enzymes/resins which resins transition between hydrophobic and ionic interactions at a pH of 5-9.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Jon P. Weber

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.